

Relations Among Correlation Functions in the High Temperature Phase of QCD with Broken SU(3)

Michael C. Birse^{a,b}, Thomas D. Cohen^a and Judith A. McGovern^{a,b}

^a *Department of Physics,*

University of Maryland, College Park, MD, 20742-4111, USA

^b *Theoretical Physics Group, Department of Physics and Astronomy,*

University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, U.K.

Abstract

Group-theoretic arguments are used to determine the dependence of two-point correlators of quark bilinears on the current quark masses. The leading difference between π and δ correlators is found to be of order m_s times a $U(1)_A$ -violating correlator. These general arguments are consistent with Schaefer's observation that if $U(1)_A$ violation persists to high enough temperatures then the strange η can be lighter than the non-strange one.

At high temperatures the $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R$ chiral symmetry of QCD (with N_f flavors of light quark) is believed to be broken only by the nonzero current quark masses. The nature of this phase is of considerable interest, in particular because of its relevance to ultrarelativistic heavy-ion collisions and the early universe. One aspect of this phase that has received recent interest [1–7] is the role of the anomalously broken $U(1)_A$ symmetry at high temperatures. Because of this anomaly, topological features of the QCD vacuum split the η' from the pion in the low-temperature phase [8]. This question, currently being studied using lattice-gauge simulations of two-flavor QCD by a number of groups [9–12], is whether these topological features persist above the QCD phase transition.

The possible role of $U(1)_A$ symmetry breaking can be studied by looking at correlation functions of composite operators constructed from quark and gluon fields and comparing ones that are related by $U(1)_A$ symmetry (and perhaps also $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R$ symmetry). All observable manifestations of anomalous $U(1)_A$ symmetry breaking should be reflected in the behavior of these correlation functions. Shuryak has suggested that, as well as the $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R$ symmetry, $U(1)_A$ symmetry might also be restored in the high temperature phase in the sense that no $U(1)_A$ -violating effects would be found in the correlation functions [1].

In a recent paper [6], we pointed out that in the limit of exact $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R$ chiral symmetry, this symmetry strongly constrains the ways in which $U(1)_A$ violation can manifest itself in the high-temperature phase. In particular it requires that all n -point correlation functions of quark bilinears are invariant under $U(1)_A$ transformations provided $n < N_f$. This means all two-point correlation functions are $U(1)_A$ -invariant for $N_f > 2$. This point had previously been noted within the context of the instanton liquid model [5] and under assumptions corresponding to a dilute instanton gas [3,4]. The symmetry argument shows that the result is general and does not depend on any particular picture for the topological aspects of the QCD vacuum that generate the nonperturbative $U(1)_A$ anomaly.

So far we have been discussing only the chiral limit of QCD, whereas in reality the $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R$ symmetry is explicitly broken by the current quark masses. It is thus not immediately clear how relevant these symmetry arguments are to a world with two light and one moderately light quark flavors [7]. In the present note we extend our arguments of Ref. [6] to the case of broken chiral and $SU(3)$ symmetries. The crucial feature for this analysis is that sufficiently far above the phase transition, or crossover region, it should be possible to make a perturbative expansion of correlators in powers of the current quark masses. If the effects of $U(1)_A$ violation persist up to such temperatures then they can only be visible in correlators of quark bilinears in the ways described here. These results should eventually be useful for interpreting lattice simulations of three-flavor QCD with two light and one heavier flavor of quark. They can also be used to understand, for example, the

results of instanton liquid calculations [7].

In the restored phase of $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R$ with zero quark masses, the only non-vanishing vacuum correlators are $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R$ singlets that are also even under parity. Even when current quark masses are included, we can still use this idea provided we restrict our consideration to temperatures that are sufficiently far above the crossover region. In this situation we can make an expansion of any correlator of quark bilinears in powers of the quark masses. Each of the terms in such an expansion is itself a correlator of quark bilinears. For example, at first order in m_s the two-point correlator between quark bilinears with the quantum numbers of pions, $\langle \bar{q}(x) i\gamma_5 \tau_1 q(x) \bar{q}(0) i\gamma_5 \tau_1 q(0) \rangle$, contains the three-point correlator

$$m_s \int d^4y \langle \bar{q}(x) i\gamma_5 \tau_1 q(x) \bar{q}(0) i\gamma_5 \tau_1 q(0) \bar{s}(y) s(y) \rangle, \quad (1)$$

where the expectation value is taken in an $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R$ -invariant vacuum. This correlator can then be expressed in terms of $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R$ singlets as described in Ref. [6]. Similarly for a correlator of n bilinears, a term of m -th order in the quark masses can be related to singlets constructed out of $n + m$ bilinears. In the case of three flavors, this analysis leads to some nontrivial conclusions which are relevant to the study of $U(1)_A$ violation in high temperature QCD.

To derive such relations, it is convenient to consider the partition function for QCD in the presence of scalar and pseudoscalar sources $S_a(x)$ and $P_a(x)$, where a runs from 0 to $N_f^2 - 1$:

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}q \mathcal{D}\bar{q} \mathcal{D}A \exp \left[- \int d^4x \left(\mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}}(x) - S_a(x) \bar{q}(x) \lambda_a q(x) - P_a(x) \bar{q}(x) i\gamma_5 \lambda_a q(x) \right) \right] \quad (2)$$

where the path integral is over fields that are (anti-)periodic in Euclidean time. Connected correlation functions of the quark bilinears can be expressed as derivatives of $\ln Z[S_a, P_a]$ with respect to the sources. For example, the correlator in the pion channel is

$$\langle \bar{q}(x) i\gamma_5 \tau_1 q(x) \bar{q}(0) i\gamma_5 \tau_1 q(0) \rangle = \left. \frac{\delta^2 \ln Z[S_a, P_a]}{\delta P_1(x) \delta P_1(0)} \right|_{\text{phys}}. \quad (3)$$

The subscript indicates that the sources are set to their physical values. If we omit the quark mass terms from $\mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}}$ then the derivatives of $\ln Z[S_a, P_a]$ at $S_a = P_a = 0$ give the correlators in the chiral limit. Correlators in the case of explicit symmetry breaking can be obtained by setting the appropriate combinations of scalar sources to equal the current quark masses.

For vanishing current quark masses chiral symmetry requires that $\ln Z[S_a, P_a]$ be invariant under $\text{SU}(N_f)_L \times \text{SU}(N_f)_R$ transformations. It can thus be expressed in terms of the group invariants. These are conveniently constructed from the following structures:

$$\Sigma = \sum_{a=0}^{N_f^2-1} (S_a + iP_a)\lambda_a \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma^\dagger = \sum_{a=0}^{N_f^2-1} (S_a - iP_a)\lambda_a \quad (4)$$

which transform respectively under the representations $(N_f, \bar{N}_f)$ and $(\bar{N}_f, N_f)$ of $\text{SU}(N_f)_L \times \text{SU}(N_f)_R$: $\Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_L \Sigma \mathbf{U}_R^\dagger$ and $\Sigma^\dagger \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_R \Sigma^\dagger \mathbf{U}_L^\dagger$. Under a $\text{U}(1)_A$ transformation Σ transforms as $\Sigma \rightarrow e^{i\theta} \Sigma$, and under a parity operation, as $\Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma^\dagger$.

As discussed in Ref. [6], these singlets can be constructed in two distinct ways. One is to take equal numbers of Σ 's and $\Sigma^\dagger$'s, coupled up to a singlet. Examples are $\text{Tr}(\Sigma_1^\dagger \Sigma_2)$, $\text{Tr}(\Sigma_1^\dagger \Sigma_2 \Sigma_3^\dagger \Sigma_4)$, $\text{Tr}(\Sigma_1^\dagger \Sigma_2) \text{Tr}(\Sigma_3^\dagger \Sigma_4)$, etc. (where $\Sigma_i \equiv \Sigma(x_i)$). All of these are not only chiral invariants; they are obviously $\text{U}(1)_A$ -invariant as well.

The only other way of obtaining a singlet is to couple N_f Σ 's or N_f $\Sigma^\dagger$'s together in an antisymmetric way. This produces two singlets:

$$\frac{1}{(N_f)!} \epsilon_{ijk\dots p} \epsilon_{i'j'k'\dots p'} (\Sigma_1)_{ii'} (\Sigma_2)_{jj'} (\Sigma_3)_{kk'} \dots (\Sigma_{N_f})_{pp'} \quad (5)$$

and the analogous expression with $\Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma^\dagger$. (All indices run from 1 to N_f .) (For identical Σ 's, these terms are just $\det \Sigma$ and $\det \Sigma^\dagger$.) By parity, only the sum has a nonvanishing vacuum expectation value. Unlike the invariants constructed out of equal numbers of Σ 's and $\Sigma^\dagger$'s, this is not $\text{U}(1)_A$ -invariant. Further chiral singlet, $\text{U}(1)_A$ -violating terms may be obtained by coupling, for instance, $N_f + 1$ Σ 's and an $\Sigma^\dagger$, etc.

Provided that the temperature considered is above the phase transition and so $\ln Z[S_a, P_a]$ has an analytic dependence on the sources, we can express $\ln Z[S_a, P_a]$ as a linear combination of $\text{SU}(N_f)_L \times \text{SU}(N_f)_R$ invariants. Each term must have the form

$$\int d^4x_1 \dots d^4x_m f(x_1 \dots x_m) I_m(x_1 \dots x_m) \quad (6)$$

where I_m is one of the invariants discussed above. The weighting function must be translationally invariant and symmetric under interchange of the arguments x_i . Such a term then gives a contribution to the correlator (3) of the form $g(x)(d^2 J_m/dP_1^2)_{\text{phys}}$ where $g(x)$ is an invariant function and J_m is the space-time-independent invariant obtained by setting all the of the sources in I_m to constants. Of the J_m , $N_f + 1$ are the independent invariants of $\text{SU}(N_f)_L \times \text{SU}(N_f)_R$, conveniently taken as $\text{Tr}[(\Sigma^\dagger \Sigma)^n]$, $n \leq N_f$, and $(\det \Sigma + \det \Sigma^\dagger)$, and all the others are powers and products of these.

In the chiral limit, of course, all the sources S_a and P_a vanish. Thus only the m th order invariants contribute to the m -point correlators. Hence, as shown in Ref. [6], all m -point correlators for $m < N_f$ are $\text{U}(1)_A$ -invariant since the lowest $\text{U}(1)_A$ -violating invariant is the determinant term. However, by studying the actual forms of the invariants for a given N_f , one can make predictions about the quark-mass-dependence of correlators. Here we will be concerned with two-point correlators in the physically interesting case of three flavors, with m_u and m_d light (and taken to be equal), and m_s not so light. Using the same notation as in Ref. [6] we can denote the scalar quark bilinears $\bar{q}(x)\lambda_a q(x)$ by $\xi_a(x)$, where $a = 0$ refers to the flavor singlet and $a = 1, \dots, N_f^2 - 1$ to the rest. Similarly we use $\phi_a(x)$ to denote the corresponding pseudoscalars. As a shorthand, we will use meson names for these quark bilinears: the pions and kaons, the scalar pions δ , $(\xi_1 \dots \xi_3)$, and scalar kaons κ , $(\xi_4 \dots \xi_7)$, the non-strange and strange scalar singlets, $\sigma = (\sqrt{2}\xi_0 + \xi_8)/\sqrt{3}$ and $\zeta = (\xi_0 - \sqrt{2}\xi_8)/\sqrt{3}$, and the pseudoscalars, η_n and η_s , which are the corresponding combinations of ϕ_0 and ϕ_8 . Of course the last four need not be mass eigenstates and there need not be bound states in any channel. There are nonvanishing vacuum expectation values for σ and ζ for which the sources are just m_u and m_s . We can then make the following observations.

First, as $\text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R$ is a subgroup of $\text{SU}(3)_L \times \text{SU}(3)_R$, if we restrict ourselves to the sources for the non-strange bilinears and ζ (which is $\text{U}(2)_L \times \text{U}(2)_R$ -invariant), the three-flavor invariants can be written in terms of the two-flavor invariants and ζ . Thus if two

correlators are equal in the $N_f = 2$ chiral limit, their difference is only of order m_u^2 with realistic masses.

Second, for any source except for those for σ and ζ , the first derivative of an irreducible invariant with respect to that source vanishes by conservation of flavor quantum numbers and parity when the physical values of the sources are substituted. Thus the second derivative of a product of irreducible invariants vanishes unless both derivatives act on the same factor. The only group structures which arise in the differences between two-point correlators of these bilinears are those which come from the four irreducible invariants, and all higher terms simply alter the invariant coefficients. By explicit calculation, differences between correlators can be found which are of order m_u^2 and therefore small even if m_s is large. Others can be found which will be of order m_s if the anomaly persists, but m_u^2 otherwise. These are therefore sensitive tests of $U(1)_A$ restoration. Denoting the correlator in (3) as Π_π and others accordingly, and with γ representing the strength of the anomaly, the relations are

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_\pi &= \Pi_\sigma + O(m_u^2) \\
\Pi_\delta &= \Pi_{\eta_n} + O(m_u^2) \\
\frac{1}{2}(\Pi_K + \Pi_{\bar{K}}) &= \Pi_{\eta_s} + O(m_u^2) \\
\Pi_\pi &= \Pi_\delta + O(\gamma m_s) + O(m_u^2) \\
\Pi_{\eta_n} &= \Pi_{\eta_s} + O(\gamma m_s) + O(m_s^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In addition the mixed $\eta_n \eta_s$ correlator is of order γm_u , so even if the anomaly persists the mixing is small. (This contrasts with the low-temperature situation where the mass eigenstates are close to η_0 and η_8 .)

The difference between the correlators in the pion and δ (scalar pion) channels is widely used to study $U(1)_A$ violation in two-flavor QCD [9–12] since both correlators can be determined from lattice calculations without need for quark-line disconnected pieces. In the three-flavor case we find that the leading term in the difference between these correlators is of order m_s times a three-point $U(1)_A$ -violating correlator. Corrections to this are of or-

der m_u^2 . Hence due to $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ symmetry the $\pi - \delta$ difference remains a good test of whether $U(1)_A$ violation persists at high temperatures.

There has also been recent interest in the behavior of the $SU(2)$ singlet pseudoscalars (η and η') at high temperatures [13,14,7]. However the correlators in both of these channels require quark-line disconnected pieces. We find that the non-strange and strange η 's decouple, as noted by Schaefer in the instanton-liquid model [7]. Moreover the correlator for the non-strange η is the same as that for the δ while that for the strange η is equal to the average of the kaon and κ (scalar kaon) correlators. Corrections to these relations are also of order m_u^2 . They provide a way to determine the correlators in the η channels without the need to evaluate disconnected pieces.

Finally, the leading term in the difference between the strange and non-strange η 's is of order m_s times an anomalous three-point correlator, with corrections of order m_s^2 . If the effect of the anomaly has the same sign above the transition temperature as below, the first term has a sign corresponding to a larger screening mass in the non-strange channel. This rather surprising result was first noted by Schaefer [7]. However the size of the corrections means that for this effect to be visible the nonperturbative effects of the anomaly are likely to have to survive well above the crossover region.

This work was supported in part by the US Department of Energy under grant no. DE-FG02-93ER-40762, and in part by the UK EPSRC. M.C.B. and J.McG. would like to thank the TQHN group at the University of Maryland for their generous hospitality.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. V. Shuryak, Comments Nucl. Part. Phys. **21**, 235 (1994); report hep-ph/9503427 (1995).
- [2] T. D. Cohen, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 1867 (1996).
- [3] S. H. Lee and T. Hatsuda, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 1871 (1996).
- [4] N. Evans, S. D. H. Hsu and M. Schwetz, Phys. Lett. **B375** 262, (1996).
- [5] T. Schaefer and E. V. Shuryak, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 1099 (1996).
- [6] M. C. Birse, T. D. Cohen and J. A. McGovern, University of Maryland report 97-014 (1996), hep-ph/9608255, Phys. Lett. **B** (to be published).
- [7] T. Schaefer, University of Washington report DOE/ER/40561-280, INT96-00-140 (1996), hep-ph/9608373.
- [8] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37**, 8 (1976); Phys. Rev. **D14**, 3432 (1976).
- [9] S. Chandrasekharan and N. Christ, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **47**, 527 (1996).
- [10] G. Boyd, F. Karsch, E. Laermann and M. Oevers, University of Bielefeld report BI-TP 96/27 (1996), hep-lat/9607046.
- [11] C. Bernard *et al.*, Utah University report UU-HEP 96/5 (1996), hep-lat/9608026; Utah University report UU-HEP 96/8 (1996), hep-lat/9611031.
- [12] J. B. Kogut, J.-F. Lagae and D. K. Sinclair, Argonne report ANL-HEP-CP-96-62 (1996), hep-lat/9608128.
- [13] J. Kapusta, D. Kharzeev and L. McLerran, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 5028 (1996).
- [14] Z. Huang and X.-N. Wang, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 5034 (1996).